

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

_____	)	
RAMACHANDRAN SEETHARAMAN	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
STONE & WEBSTER, INC., a subsidiary	)	1:05-CV-11105 RWZ
of SHAW GROUP, INC., JOE GREEN,	)	(Consolidated With
NICK ZERVOS, DAVID EDWARDS	)	C.A. No. 1:05-CV-11863)
AND JOHN MARTIN,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**SECOND JOINT STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to the Court's orders dated January 20, 2006 and April 21, 2006, plaintiff Ramachandran Seetharaman ("Seetharaman") and defendants Stone & Webster, Inc., Joe Green, Nick Zervos, David Edwards and John Martin (defendants are referred to collectively as "Stone & Webster") hereby submit this Second Joint Status Report to apprise the Court of the status of Seetharaman's appeal to the Administrative Review Board (the "ARB") of the November 30, 2005 Recommended Decision and Order of Daniel F. Sutton, Administrative Law Judge in the whistleblower action that Seetharaman commenced against Stone & Webster in the Department of Labor.<sup>1</sup> By the Recommended Decision and Order, the Administrative Law Judge recommended that Seetharaman's Complaint against Stone & Webster in that whistleblower action be dismissed in its entirety.

<sup>1</sup> The Court's January 20, 2006 order requiring the parties to file a status report every three months also provides in part that "45 days after report, defendant shall answer." Respectfully, the Court at the January 19, 2006 Further Scheduling Conference provided Stone & Webster with forty-five days from the expected decision of the ARB, not from this status report, in which to answer or move in response to Seetharaman's Complaint.

Seetharaman appealed that Recommended Decision and Order to the ARB. The ARB's original briefing schedule required Seetharaman to file his initial brief on or before February 13, 2006. Seetharaman, however, did not comply with that order, and the ARB rejected his initial brief for failing to comply with the ARB's procedural rules governing the length and formatting of briefs.

The ARB then granted Seetharaman a further extension of time in which to file his initial brief to March 31, 2006. Seetharaman filed his initial brief. Stone & Webster then obtained a nine-day extension from the ARB in which to file its brief and timely filed its brief in response on May 10, 2006. Seetharaman then filed a reply brief, in accordance with a further extension of time, on May 31, 2006.

Seetharaman's appeal to the ARB has now been fully briefed by both sides, and Seetharaman and Stone & Webster are awaiting a decision from the ARB.

Seetharaman and Stone & Webster will file a further status report on or before October 17, 2006 or at such other time as the Court may order.

Plaintiff,

RAMACHANDRAN SEETHARAMAN,

By his attorney,

/s/ Howard I. Wilgoren

---

Howard I. Wilgoren, BBO No. 527840  
6 Beacon Street, Suite 700  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108  
(617) 523-5233

Dated: July 19, 2006

Defendants,

STONE & WEBSTER, INC.,  
JOE GREEN, NICK ZERVOS,  
DAVID EDWARDS AND JOHN  
MARTIN,

By their attorneys,

/s/ Kevin P. Sweeney

---

Paul J. Murphy, BBO No. 363490  
Kevin P. Sweeney, BBO No. 548761  
Menard, Murphy & Walsh LLP  
60 State Street - 34th Floor  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617) 832-2500